

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/915,426	07/26/2001	Martin Kessler	1703	6991	
7:	590 08/20/2003				
•	TRIKER & STENBY		EXAMINER		
103 East Neck Huntington, NY			DUDA,	RINA I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2837	2837	
÷	•		DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	0.4/
Advisory Action	09/915,426	KESSLER ET AL.	CAV
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	<u> </u>
•	Rina I Duda	2837	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of th er: (1) a timely filed amendm ppeal (with appeal fee); or (	is application. A proper replacent which places the application	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of this		forth in the final rejection, whichever	is later. In no
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f).	er than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	extension and the corresponding ame ened statutory period for reply origin	ount of the fee. The appropriate exte ally set in the final Office action; or (2	nsion fee under 2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:		
(a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require for	urther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);		
<ul><li>(c)</li></ul>	ion in better form for appea	by materially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without car NOTE:	nceling a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claim	IS.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		een considered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed S	SOLELY to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amenda explanation of how the new or amended claim			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\boxtimes$ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>18 Ju</u>	<u>une 2003</u> is a)∏ approved	or b)⊠ disapproved by the	Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
10. Other:		Rina I Duda Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2837	
.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)	dvisory Action	Pari	t of Paper No. 12

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment does not address all the issues raised in the final action, the USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claim 7 was not considered by applicant, as stated in the final action the entire disclosure (description of the invention and drawings) does not support the subject matter of claim 7. Also, the USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 8 and 9 was not address. Finally, the examiner still believes that the applied prior art shows all the structural limitations as recited in claims 1, 3-6, and 8.